

# SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress  
1st Session

Vote No. 417

September 13, 1995, 11:36 a.m.  
Page S-13491 Temp. Record

## WELFARE REFORM BILL/3 Percent Indian Set-aside

**SUBJECT:** Family Self-Sufficiency Act of 1995 . . . H.R. 4. Daschle amendment No. 2671 to the Dole modified perfecting amendment No. 2280 to the committee substitute amendment.

### ACTION: AMENDMENT REJECTED, 38-62

**SYNOPSIS:** As reported with a committee substitute amendment, H.R. 4, the Family Self-Sufficiency Act of 1995, will overhaul six of the Nation's ten largest welfare programs.

The Dole modified perfecting amendment would strike the provisions of the committee substitute amendment and insert in lieu thereof substitute provisions, entitled "The Work Opportunity Act of 1995."

**The Daschle amendment** would require 3 percent of the welfare funds provided by this bill to go to Indian tribes. The 3 percent would be subtracted from total funding before dividing the remaining 97 percent among the States. Funding would be provided directly to the tribes instead of through the States. (Under the Dole amendment, Federal funding would be provided directly to Native Americans on a tribe-by-tribe basis based on actual AFDC populations.)

**Those favoring** the amendment contended:

The Daschle amendment would use 3 percent of the funds for family assistance grants for direct tribal grants. That 3 percent would be taken equally from the funding for all the States. Indians would be given this extra money in recognition of their unique, urgent needs. The poverty rate for Indian children is 60.3 percent, which is three times the national average. Per capita income on reservations is \$4,000, compared to the national average of \$14,000. Some reservations suffer from unemployment rates of nearly 90 percent. Indian tribes need more money because they are in worse economic shape than all other communities in America. It will take much larger investments, therefore, to make those communities self-sufficient. We trust our colleagues agree, and will join us in voting in favor of this amendment.

(See other side)

YEAS (38)			NAYS (62)			NOT VOTING (0)	
Republicans (4 or 7%)	Democrats (34 or 74%)		Republicans (50 or 93%)	Democrats (12 or 26%)		Republicans (0)	Democrats (0)
Burns	Akaka	Harkin	Abraham	Inhofe	Bryan		
Campbell	Baucus	Inouye	Ashcroft	Jeffords	Bumpers		
Domenici	Biden	Johnston	Bennett	Kassebaum	Glenn		
Pressler	Bingaman	Kennedy	Bond	Kempthorne	Heflin		
	Boxer	Kerrey	Brown	Kyl	Hollings		
	Bradley	Kerry	Chafee	Lott	Lautenberg		
	Breaux	Kohl	Coats	Lugar	Levin		
	Byrd	Leahy	Cochran	Mack	Lieberman		
	Conrad	Mikulski	Cohen	McCain	Nunn		
	Daschle	Moseley-Braun	Coverdell	McConnell	Reid		
	Dodd	Moynihan	Craig	Murkowski	Robb		
	Dorgan	Murray	D'Amato	Nickles	Rockefeller		
	Exon	Pell	DeWine	Packwood			
	Feingold	Pryor	Dole	Roth			
	Feinstein	Sarbanes	Faircloth	Santorum			
	Ford	Simon	Frist	Shelby			
	Graham	Wellstone	Gorton	Simpson			
			Gramm	Smith			
			Grams	Snowe			
			Grassley	Specter			
			Gregg	Stevens			
			Hatch	Thomas			
			Hatfield	Thompson			
			Helms	Thurmond			
			Hutchison	Warner			

#### EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

#### SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

**Those opposing** the amendment contended:

Indians make up roughly 1.5 percent of the current AFDC caseload, yet our colleagues suggest that they should receive 3 percent of all the funding. Basically, they suggest that every Indian in America on welfare should receive double the average amount of welfare benefits and those benefits should be paid for by every State in the Union, including States that do not even have Indians. This suggestion is completely illogical. Currently, States administer the AFDC program for Indians. Each State's family assistance grant under this bill will be based on the level of AFDC benefits that it currently gives, including to Indians. Logically, therefore, any amount given directly to an Indian tribe instead of through the State in which it is located should be taken from that State's grant. The Dole amendment, which also would give direct grants, would follow this approach. Further, each tribe should receive grants according to its own particular needs. Giving an arbitrary 3 percent of the total, as proposed by the Daschle amendment, is not acceptable. We prefer the approach of the Dole amendment, which would be to continue funding in grant form based on the current amount that Indian welfare recipients receive in entitlement spending. This approach would more closely match local Indian needs. Some reservation are certainly better off than others; others are located in areas with lower costs of living. Current State AFDC funding levels for reservations take these factors into consideration. Clearly the Dole amendment would be fairer to all Americans and would more carefully serve the needs of Native Americans than would the Daschle amendment. We therefore urge our colleagues to reject the Daschle amendment.